

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation; HANESBRANDS, INC., a Maryland corporation; and HBI BRANDED APPAREL ENTERPRISES, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiffs,

v.

YANG XUEZHAO, an individual; SHAOBAI ZHANG, an individual; SHEN LIJUAN, an individual; YONGZENG CHEN, an individual; LIN ZHISHANG, an individual; HUANG SHUHUA, an individual; CHEN JINAI, an individual; FU YONGBIN, an individual; ZHANG PENGJU, an individual; XIAOJUAN ZHU, an individual; YIMEI LI, an individual; and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00766-RSM

**Consolidated Cases:**

2:21-cv-00766  
2:21-cv-00767  
2:21-cv-00768  
2:21-cv-00769  
2:21-cv-00770  
2:21-cv-00771  
2:21-cv-00772  
2:21-cv-00773  
2:21-cv-00774  
2:21-cv-00775  
2:21-cv-00776  
2:21-cv-00777  
2:21-cv-00778

ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
PLAINTIFFS' *EX PARTE* MOTION TO  
FILE OVER-LENGTH *EX PARTE*  
MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT

This matter comes before the Court on the *Ex Parte* Motion by Plaintiffs Amazon.com, Inc., HanesBrands, Inc., and HBI Branded Apparel Enterprises, LLC for leave to file an over-length *ex parte* Motion for Default Judgment, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(f). Dkt. #67. Local Civil Rule 7(e)(1) provides that motions brought under Local Civil Rule 7(d)(1), including

1 motions for default judgment where the opposing party has not appeared, are limited to 2,100  
2 words. Plaintiffs now request 6,000 additional words, for a total limit of 8,100 words. *Id.* at 2.

3 “Motions seeking approval to file an over-length motion or brief are disfavored...” LCR  
4 7(f).

5 Plaintiffs ask for a 386% increase. To support this extreme request, Plaintiffs only remind  
6 the Court that what we have here are thirteen consolidated cases against ten Defendants, with  
7 four claims. Dkt. #67 at 2. Plaintiffs acknowledge that they will attempt to “rely on the facts set  
8 forth in their declarations and prior filings where possible.” *Id.* Further details are not provided.  
9 There is no attached declaration.  
10

11 The Court finds that Plaintiffs fail to set forth a sufficient basis for nearly quadrupling  
12 briefing on an *ex parte* motion. Although this case involves a large number of defendants, it is  
13 not otherwise unique or unusual considering the significant amount of this type of litigation  
14 Amazon has filed in this District. The Court assumes that much of what Amazon is attempting  
15 to brief can instead be included in declarations or replaced with references to prior filings. On  
16 the other hand, the Court can imagine how the number of Defendants here might require a more  
17 modest increase in briefing length.  
18

19 Accordingly, having considered Plaintiffs’ Motion and finding good cause, the Court  
20 ORDERS that Plaintiffs’ Motion is GRANTED IN PART. Plaintiffs’ forthcoming motion for  
21 default judgment is not to exceed 4,200 words.  
22

23 DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2024.  
24

25 

26 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
28